

### REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 23, 2004, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by September 23, 2004.

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 7-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EU patent 0548732 A2 to Koelner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,606 to Pyrhoenen. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Koelner, Pyrhoenen, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,512,792 to Bawin.

In the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention over the cited reference combination by adding the features of claim 5, which was canceled. The Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 defines a patentably distinct combination of elements neither shown nor suggested by the cited references.

Amended claim 1 now defines that the feature that the stack of sheets is supported with the squirrel cage between the reinforcement elements. This feature cannot be derived from any of the references, whether viewed alone or in combination. By bracing the rotor 30 between the reinforcement elements 40, 42, the tension or stress on the short circuit rings 36 is reduced. In this manner, the allowable rpm of the rotor can be increased and the safety of the electrical machine at nominal speed is improved.

Because neither the Koelner reference nor the Pyrhoenen reference suggests supporting the stack of sheets with the squirrel cage between the reinforcement elements, the rejection of claim 1 under Section 103 cannot stand. Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under Section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. ***ACS Hosp. Sys., Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp.***, 221 USPQ 929, 932, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Here, the prior art of record fails to provide any such suggestion or incentive.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4 and 6-15 are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

In light of the foregoing amendments and arguments in support of patentability, the Applicants respectfully submit that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'S' followed by a diagonal line and a horizontal line.

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700